



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

such authority may be inferred from the conduct of the directors or their knowledge of the facts and failure to object. *2 THOMP., CORP.* (Ed. 2) 1576; *3 CLARK & MARSHALL, CORP.*, § 700; *Barber v. Stromberg Co.*, 81 Neb. 517, 116 N. W. 157; *Lowe v. Ring*, 115 Wis. 575, 92 N. W. 238. The corporation was held bound where it had been the custom of the general manager to execute notes with the knowledge of the officers and stockholders, and payments had been made by the corporation. *Cadillac State Bank v. Cadillac & Co.*, 129 Mich. 15, 88 N. W. 67. A person who enters into a contract with a corporate officer or agent, knowing he is not acting for the corporation, cannot of course hold the corporation liable in contract. *10 Cyc. 942; Patten v. Climax Quick Tanning Co.*, 40 N. Y. App. Div. 607, 57 N. Y. Supp. 758. The rule is the same where the circumstances put one on inquiry. *Wheeler v. Home Savings Bank*, 188 Ill. 34, 58 N. E. 598, 80 Am. St. Rep. 161; *Moores v. Citizens' Bank*, 111 U. S. 156; *Wilson v. M. E. R. Co.*, 120 N. Y. 145. But persons contracting with such corporation are not bound to know of a by-law thereof limiting the apparent authority of such manager. *Standard Fashion Co. v. Seigel-Cooper Co.*, 44 N. Y. App. Div. 121, 60 N. Y. Supp. 739; *Barber v. Stromberg, supra*. The legitimate authority of a general manager, in the absence of known limitations, must depend largely upon the circumstances of each particular case and usually presents a question of fact for the jury. *Grand Rapids Elec. Co. v. Walsh Mfg. Co.*, 142 Mich. 4, 105 N. W. 1; *Colorado Springs Co. v. American Pub. Co.*, 97 Fed. 843, 38 C. C. A. 433.

CORPORATIONS—TRANSFER OF STOCK—RIGHTS OF AN ATTACHING CREDITOR AS AGAINST AN UNREGISTERED TRANSFEREE.—G, the owner of the stock in question, transferred it to F in satisfaction of a debt. Later C, another creditor of G, attached the stock, obtained judgment, and on execution became the purchaser of the stock. The stock was transferred on the books of the company to C before F had requested a transfer to him. The question arose as to which had the better title and consequently the right to vote the stock. *Held*, that the rights of F, the unregistered transferee, were superior to those of C, the attaching creditor. *Flostroy v. Wm. B. Corby Coal Co. et al.* (N. J. 1912) 85 Atl. 578.

On this question the courts are about evenly divided and it is impossible to reconcile the decisions. In 9 MICH. L. REV. 258 may be found a list of the states on each side of the question with a citation from each state. In support of the principal case probably the leading case is *Broadway Bank v. McElrath*, 13 N. J. Eq. 24, 2 WILGUS, CAS. 1663. The leading case holding the opposite view is *Fisher v. Essex Bank*, 5 Gray (Mass.) Rep. 373, 2 WILGUS, CAS. 1668. An interesting note containing many citations on both sides of the question may be found in 2 WILGUS, CAS. 1673. There is also an interesting article on the question in 9 COL. L. REV. 433.

CRIMINAL LAW—NUMBER OF CHALLENGES ALLOWED JOINT DEFENDANTS.—Three defendants were charged with the crime of perjury. Upon a joint trial one was acquitted. The two who were convicted appeal and allege as error that the three defendants were confined to the same number of peremptory challenges of jurors as if there had been but one defendant. The